

RECEIVED
OREGON OPERATIONS OFFICE

JUN 13 2016

EPA-REGION 10

Attn: Harbor Comments

June 10, 2016

U.S. EPA

805 SW Broadway, Suite 500

Portland, Oregon 97205

Re: Proposed "cleanup" plans

Dear Providers,

As a U.S. Government Agency, charged with "protection and sustainability of the environment" amongst other duties, I find the article in the Oregonian (newspaper), dated June 9, 2016, to be reprehensible. Is it really true that your agency decided a "balanced approach" disbursement of Super Funds for the limited dredging of the Willamette River? The Willamette, as you well know, is a primary tributary of the Columbia River, a struggling resource that provides habitat, power sources, fishing, boating, shipping, commerce, and a multitude of other services to humans and various sources of marine and aquatic life. To propose "limited" dredging and let "Natural elements" do the rest is preposterous! Using tax payer funds, of which most of the Super Funds money is, should also equally include those who were major players in dumping their waste and pollutants into the river in the first place. A "balanced" approach isn't acceptable and it smacks of pandering to corporate influence and greed. Those companies who polluted knew, for years, what they were doing to the environment by putting all of us at risk. In my opinion, they should have their collective feet held to the fire until they cough up EQUAL amounts to match what the public is being charged.

I tend to agree with Mr. Travis Williams, executive director of Willamette Riverkeeper org., calling this plan "nowhere close to where this cleanup should be." The criticism from the collective Native Americans is also valid. They are very concerned that their livelihoods will be negatively impacted by this plan. It's not the fault of the voting public that these studies and recommendations took years to come to fruition. Corporate interference, corruption, and graft also played a part. That's why some should be held not only fiscally responsible to the max, but some should face criminal charges and steep fines as well.

I fully understand the costs involved here, but to let corporate America walk away with a minimal investment, compared to the rest of us (per capita, collectively, they are only paying about 37% of the costs they should be paying) is unfair and wrong.

Please go back to the drawing board and make this plan inclusive (clean it all up...not just part of it; hoping Mother Nature will do the rest...there's already enough pollution in the rivers now as it is!), and charge those corporations what they really should be paying. Thank you for attending to this matter without bias.

Sincerely,

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

Gearhart, Oregon 97138